

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/683,659

Applicant(s)

RUSH ET AL.

Examiner

Timothy P. Solak

Art Unit

3746

All Participants:

(1) Timothy P. Solak.

(2) Alison de Runtz.

Status of Application: Allowance

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 January 2005

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

11, 49 and 52

Prior art documents discussed:

Brenan et al. (6,059,546)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

I informed Alison de Runtz that the title was too long and suggested deleting the term method from the title. Alison de Runtz stressed her opinion that since the claims included a method the term needed to be in the title.

I questioned Alison de Runtz about the phrase "DC to DC converter" in Claim 44. Alison de Runtz informed me that the term "DC to DC converter" was correct and supported by the disclosure.

On 01/31/2005, I informed Alison de Runtz, that the claimed "biasing force" was insufficient to overcome the prior art, namely the Brenan et al. reference. I suggested adding a --biasing element-- as a possible solution.

On 02/01/2005, Alison de Runtz and I discussed the elements in Brenan et al., Figure 3. With the labeled "Figure 3" in the upper right hand corner, I identified the "resilient housing" as the diaphragms (not labeled), "the member" as the horizontal rod (not labeled) connecting the two diaphragms and the actuator as elements 1-3. I further informed Alison de Runtz, that the pump in Figure 3, move between three positions. The first position was as depicted in Figure 3, position 2 would move the member to the right, and position three would move it the left. As depicted in Figure 3, the pump was biased into the first position.

Alison de Runtz informed me, that she would fax a proposed amendment (received on 02/01/2005, now attached) including changes to further define the inlet connections.

On 02/03/2005, I informed Alison de Runtz, that the proposed changes appeared to be fine. I further suggest making similar changes to the method claims. Alison de Runtz informed me that she would fax a proposed amendment (received on 02/04/2005, now attached).

After reviewing the proposed amendment, I informed Alison de Runtz that the changes over came the prior art and suggested faxing an amendment to be entered by an Examiner Amendment.

Alison de Runtz agreed with all the changes set forth in the Examiner's Amendment.